"Fashion acolytes or environmental saviours? When will young people have had 'enough'?"

Dr Rebecca Collins, University of Chester

With: Sion Platts-Kilburn, Matthew Norton, Samantha Jarvis, Rachel Cookson, Lucy Noden, Olivia Buckley, Nikita Patel, Zach Stuhldreer

Introduction

Young consumers in the global north have a hard time in debates about sustainable consumption. On the one hand promoters of sustainability – including academic scholars of environmental education – have reified young people as sustainability 'saviours'. Constructed as 'Trojan horses' of new, less environmentally impactful modes of consumption (Collins and Hitchings 2012), their purported facility for trend-setting has led to their positioning as the catalyst for ripples of change, spreading out through friends, peers and family members to wider society (e.g. Ballantyne et al. 2006; Larsson et al., 2010). At the same time, and somewhat in contradiction, popular perceptions of twenty-first century adolescents' relationship with global consumer culture tend to describe hedonistic youths, more concerned with the pursuit of the latest 'must-have' item than that item's socio-environmental impacts or the waste that might result from frequent rounds of replacement or 'upgrade'. Academic studies from the last two decades have lent some support to this characterisation (e.g. Autio and Heinonen 2004; Phoenix 2005) but with important nuance – that young people's preoccupation with acquisition of the latest fashions, technologies or other consumer items is often driven less by explicit pleasure-seeking and more by anxiety fuelled by the social demands of an increasingly heavily materialised youth culture. However, in all of the debate around young people's consumption and its relative (un)sustainability consideration of what produces (dis)satisfaction – indeed, a sense of (not) 'enough' – for young consumers has been problematically absent. Yet understanding what is required to fulfil the complex socio-cultural and material 'needs' characteristic of adolescent self-formation is fundamental to establishing the feasibility of placing any kind of responsibility for driving more sustainable modes of consumption on young people's shoulders.

When the term 'teenager' was coined in the 1950s it was to unite young people as a group with distinct consumption preferences (Abrams 1959). Since then, young people have been constructed as a demographic profoundly concerned with the role of material goods in establishing, performing and communicating identities and group affiliations (e.g. Croghan et al. 2006; Marion and Nairn 2011; Miles 2000). Today there is arguably an intensity to today's youth's relationship with material-technological culture which sets it apart from that of previous generations. This intensity may be viewed as symptomatic of the fact that today's youth are largely socialised within contexts of hyper-connectedness; indeed, certainly in the global north there is almost an ontological expectation around connectedness. If, as a young person, one cannot be found on Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram, or is unable to participate in Snapchat or WhatsApp, the risk of 'missing out' on a key event looms large. This both responds to contemporary material-technological culture and necessitates its perpetuation. Whilst the social pressure to materially realise these connections directly fuels desire for new possessions, these pressures also work more insidiously, amplifying extant youthful anxieties related to status, competence and self-efficacy which many turn to material possessions to fulfil (Isaksen and Roper 2012; Sweeting et al. 2012). In particular, the omnipresence of social media platforms – just a click away via the equally ubiquitous smartphone – exerts a powerful pull on young people's desire to exhibit themselves and the material things fundamental to the co-constitution of that self. The recent YouTube phenomenon of the "haul girl"

(Jeffries 2011) – young women who make and post online videos about their most recent purchases – serves to emphasise the thrall and the potency of virtual spaces for communicating identities that firmly position a consumer identity as highly desirable.

For most other young people who inhabit social media, curating their identity online via photographs instantly uploaded to Facebook or Instagram may seem, if not great fun, then simply the latest social obligation to characterise contemporary youth culture (Cleland Woods and Scott 2015). Yet holding up such a conspicuous lens to their materially constituted selves risks creating standards – of style, novelty, and the ability to 'keep up' with change – which it may prove hard to meet. The subsequent pressures may be exacerbated since the materials-technologies most fundamental to the material culture of youth are controlled by producers at rates of change which, at present, young people (as other groups) feel powerless to contest (e.g. McAfee et al. 2004). Thus, whilst the requirement for the kind of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986) characterised by possession of these materials-technologies increasingly shapes young people's worlds, the opportunities to fully appropriate and express that capital take on the qualities of a mirage – no sooner does one approach, or even touch, the 'latest' desirable garment or gadget then its very desirability fades, superseded by a newer, shinier chimera just out of reach.

It would seem, then, that young people do not blithely consume for consumption's sake (cf. Veblen 1915). Rather, they may be struggling to comply with contemporary notions of 'enough' which are characterised by profusion; a profusion which is necessitated by social anxieties or vulnerabilities associated with 'being without' certain material things, which are illuminated by the glare of social media. In order to interrogate this 'enough-profusion' tension this chapter draws on recent empirical work carried out by a team of young researchers based on focus groups with their peers. It explores how young people construct and realise 'enough' in the context of i) technology and ii) clothing. A brief methodology is provided before summaries of the focus group data are presented. This is followed by a critical discussion of how the emergent themes might begin to elaborate the meaning of 'enough' in British twenty-first century youth material culture.

Investigating 'Sustainable Futures'

The data which informs this chapter was collected by two third-year undergraduate student groups as part of an assessed 'consultancy' project for a Geography degree module entitled *Sustainable Futures*. The projects were carried out over a period of 12 weeks between January and April 2015. Each group of four students was provided with the same brief, which stipulated the following aim:

Aim: To design and complete a qualitative research project exploring how the concept of 'enough' impacts on university students' consumption

Context regarding the significance of the concept of 'enough' in sustainability debates was provided in the written brief, and this was elaborated upon in a face-to-face briefing meeting between the author (who acted as the project 'client') and the student groups. The students were free to select their preferred qualitative research techniques; both selected focus groups. Having discussed the brief both within their individual groups and all together, the students decided that one would focus on clothing, the other on technology. The clothing group conducted three focus groups involving a total of 16 students: one with all male participants; one with all female participants; and one with both male and female participants. The technology group conducted two focus groups, both involving male and female students, with 12 participants in total. All participants were aged 20-21 and represented a range of socio-economic backgrounds. The data collected was used to inform

two pieces of assessed work produced by the students for the author as the project 'client': i) a 15 minute group presentation outlining key findings; ii) individually-written 2000-word 'consultancy' reports. The discussion in this chapter draws on the student groups' analysis of their focus group data and combines it with the author-client's wider analysis of (un)sustainable material cultures of youth.

Enough Gadgets

Two focus groups focused on the role of personal technology in young people's lives. Attention centred on mobile phones (specifically smartphones, which all participants possessed), laptops or other personal computers, and tablets. Two key themes emerged: the relationship between connectivity and social competence; and conceptualisations of material durability and 'breakage'. In one sense participants' comments about their desire for constant connectivity simply lend weight to extant analyses of the role of technologies in facilitating social relationships (Livingstone 2002, 2011). Anxiety about 'missing out' was clearly articulated by some, illustrated by a lively debate in one group about whether or not the messaging app Snapchat constituted a 'necessity', thus clearly affirming the participatory function of technologies such as smartphones in the practice of contemporary youth sociality. Attention was also drawn to the use of technologies as an information portal, including in formal education contexts. At the University of Chester where these students were based much institutional information is communicated through the 'university app'. The students' home department (Geography and International Development) also makes significant use of technology-enhanced learning across its programmes. This reinforced the perceived 'necessity' of certain devices for participation in student life, with scholarly uses constituting an additional legitimization tactic for their acquisition.

It was thus made clear in both focus groups that adolescent life – particularly student life – 'demands' access to particular technologies. The most prized functionality related to instant messaging, with a range of apps associated with study, shopping and entertainment also mentioned. The value attached to these functions was placed in tension with participants' views on the material durability of their gadgets, which in turn opened up insightful discussion on what constituted 'breakage' of these items. One female participant noted that her phone was materially more durable than those of her peers and that her battery lasted longer than most. Yet she valued neither of these characteristics as highly as the speed of its messaging functionality or the range of apps available to her:[1]

> FT1: "I wish mine was an iPhone. Mine's a Nokia , so it's, uh… it's a brick, which is great, you know, it lasts a long time but [an iPhone] is faster, your internet will be faster, you have a lot more memory on it and that kind of thing. And a lot of apps, so apps and stuff like that you can only, like, mine's a Windows phone, so a lot of apps, like from the app store, or, you know, some things you can't actually access unless you have an iPhone."
>
> FT2: "What sort of things? Come on…"
>
> FT1: "Snapchat."
>
> FT2: "Snapchat's not a necessity, is it?"

[1] The fact that Snapchat was not one of these proved to be a major point of frustration.

A male participant who regularly dropped his phone leading to material damage reported that he would buy a more robust handset over a sleeker-looking brand – but only if the functionality was the same.

When each group was asked what constituted 'breakage' of their phone or laptop, the majority referred to failure of functionality and slow performance rather than material damage. One student suggested that a gadget starts to 'break' "when it will no longer allow you to use it in the way that you normally would." Another said, "It's not more… that there's something new out there, it's more that what you've got now is failing you more." These comments intersected with widely-held frustration directed towards technology companies that premature obsolescence 'forced' upgrades described by these young people as unnecessary. Although some might have been irritated by easily scratched casing or the lack of availability of certain apps, these were not viewed as failings requiring imminent upgrade. Rather, there was a sense amongst most participants that they would be content to continue using their phone beyond the two-year timespan they collectively defined as 'typical' for their peer group's phone usage – so long as batteries and operating systems allowed them to do so.

Whilst the focus group participants – arguably justifiably – pointed to the production decisions of technology manufacturers as underpinning aspects of their dissatisfaction with their gadgets, there was less acknowledgement of their own role in maximising the longevity of these items. Despite articulating views that smartphones, in particular, were not generally of robust design, little comment was made on steps taken to take care of, maintain or repair these items. This may reflect the fact that these young people, unlike previous generations, have grown up with gadgets as an easily accessible – and replaceable – consumer good. The disconnection from their physical relationship with these objects (as well as the financial obligations associated with their acquisition or replacement if parents were bearing the cost) perhaps obscures the ways in which physical gestures contribute to dissatisfaction with items such as smartphones, through forms of deportment aligned with the (unintended) creation of material damage. Beyond this physical disconnect, there was also little awareness that, aside from the sometimes overwhelming 'choice' of gadgets and their associated communication methods, there was also the choice to communicate using mechanisms less vulnerable to technology manufacturers' decisions about what apps to install (or not) or software to keep running (or not). Only one participant in the project referred to friends who had given up their smartphones and reverted to a more 'basic' handset:

> BT4: "I've got some friends and they did it and they feel very relaxed now, they don't feel overloaded all the time. They say they're happier like that."

Still, despite this anecdotal report of the benefits of choosing non-participation in the hubbub of constant connectivity and proscribed communication, none of the participants in this project seemed keen to try this for themselves. This highlights how the scripting of young people's social practices by material objects – or the producers of those objects – remains hidden to the young people who perform them, in ways that may obscure their role in the production of their own dissatisfaction.

Both focus groups sought consensus on what constituted 'enough' personal technology for their peer group. Agreement crystallised around a smartphone capable of lasting two years and a laptop which should last four to five years. Particularly in the case of the smartphone this seemed to reflect the students' experiences of designed-in obsolescence; two years was reportedly the point at which components (batteries) and functionality often began to fail. Rather than being driven by a concern to acquire the 'latest' gadget, what drove these young people's technology consumption was a social

imperative to access the most popular modes of communication for their peer group, specifically smartphone apps such as Snapchat. Indeed, such was the extent to which social and self-esteem followed from participation in these specific modes of connection that possession of the necessary means might be viewed as a distinct form of Bourdieusian cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986). 'Connection capital' may now, for the twenty-first century British youth, be at the top of the list of social attributes to acquire.

Reflecting the longstanding youth cultural imperative around peer connectivity, and the requirement to participate in order to competently perform social roles and relationships, these actions raise questions about the nature and scope of young people's agency in fulfilling these aims. If young people's 'communication culture' is so profoundly structured by technology producers, to what extent is this culture really their own? Might forms of connectivity less embedded in traditional capitalist production be beneficial both in terms of environmental sustainability and young people's everyday life satisfaction and emotional wellbeing? There may, after all, be mechanisms through which 'connection capital' can be engendered and expressed which fulfil youthful needs for both connectivity and autonomy outside the strictures imposed by producers.

I will return to some of the ideas in the discussion, following consideration of what three further focus groups considered 'enough' clothing.

Enough Garments

The dominant factor shaping participants' views of 'enough' clothing was, perhaps unsurprisingly, cultural norms around novelty, most significantly how expectations associated with these norms have become grossly amplified by social media. Tied into participants' discussion of how they responded to these pressures were references to laundering practices and tight student budgets.

There was strong feeling amongst the majority of participants in the three 'clothing' focus groups that the notion of 'enough' was largely invisible to their peer group because of the youth cultural expectation to be seen wearing different clothes all the time. Although there was some acknowledgement of problems associated with this – related to personal psychological wellbeing as much as environmental sustainability – as one of the female-only focus group participants identified, "But it's completely our culture and it's completely normal." Across all three focus groups there was shared experience of a sense of social obligation to wear different clothes for key occasions. Participants in the all-male focus group said:

> MP2: "… people remember if you wear the same shirt out twice in a row."
>
> MP5: "People definitely see that as a negative."
>
> MP2: "Exactly, like you're some sort of scumbag with only one shirt. […] People won't say it but they will recognise the fact… it's social standing, as well, you want to wear something new."

The very nature of youth culture – as a space characterised by the jostle for recognition, status and paradoxical 'being-a-bit-different-whilst-also-fitting-in' – has inevitably always demanded the acquisition of 'novel' (if not always 'new', in the sense of virgin) material things in order to communicate shifting affiliations and senses of self. However, recent years have seen the emergence of two significant cultural phenomena. First, the material 'tools' employed to communicate these relationships (such as clothing) have become subject to increasingly rapid cycles of change (McAfee et al. 2004), making relatively new garments seem 'old' simply because they are

no longer 'current'. Second, the rise of social media (in conjunction with smartphone technology) has meant that, for young people, even the most mundane social events are documented photographically. The result has been a public record of 'what you wore and when you wore it'. Participants in the all-female focus group illustrated the challenges this presents:

> FP2: "… before if you wore something with one or two friends, like a little group, no-one would ever know and then you could wear it again. However, now because everything is on Facebook, especially on a night out, everyone loves to take a photo, so everyone sees that outfit. So next time you go out […] you do think, oh, it's going to be on Facebook photos, oh I can't wear the same thing."
>
> FP3: "I did it the other day. You know how everyone did their pictures with their dissertations? I had one done and I was wearing this jumper, jeans, boots and my coat, and I went out again and went to the beach with my friend and knew that she would be taking photos and I was wearing the exact same outfit. I was like, I can't, because that picture will go on top of the picture, with different dates but the same picture, and I had to change."

Here the documentary nature of social media is presented as problematic. Yet others in the same group – whilst noting social media's role in perpetuating a sense of 'not enough' clothing – made comments which suggested that, even acknowledging frustrations like those above, anxieties can be relatively easily neutralised by looking to the next acquisition:

> "… people are looking now for bikinis and dresses for summer and seeing, like, people on Instagram, like, getting their bikini pics out… *[laughter]* So, like, you want to go and get a nice bikini so now I'm going to order one off Asos when I get back. *[laughter]*"

In referencing online fashion retailer, Asos, this participant links the multitude of consumption opportunities afforded by the internet with comments from some participants about interpreting the concept of 'enough' with reference to 'enough choice'. The discourse of 'choice' occupied an ambivalent position in the focus group discussions, although, even taking into account the small sample size, there was an interesting variation in views between the two genders. Whilst female participants were more often concerned with selecting the (spatially) largest high street shops to give them 'enough choice', male participants were more focused on the practicalities of having 'enough choice' within their day-to-day wardrobe to mean, for example, that it was not necessary to wear the same t-shirt twice in one week. As one male participant said, "If I'm wearing the same t-shirt twice in a week I would probably want more." The frequency with which male participants had to do laundry was used as a proxy for 'enough' of particular types of clothing.

Discussion of laundering presented a further interesting tension between the quality and quantity of clothes consumed. There was widespread acknowledgement across the three groups that garments from the very low cost clothing retailers (Primark was named as an example) were often "ruined" after only two or three laundry cycles. Despite this, low cost retailers remained popular. This was perhaps to be expected of students on tight budgets, but interesting nuances emerged in participants' responses to what 'enough' meant when it came to balancing their budgets with their desire for new clothes. Both female and male students reported that their spending was dictated less by questions such as, "Do I have enough t-shirts?" and more by the question, "Have I spent enough?" Certainly the young women agreed that if the clothes they were buying were cheap they needed to buy more of them in order feel they had 'enough'. This suggests that much of the imperative driving their clothing consumption was not need – real or perceived – or even desire, but a compulsion to participate in a culturally valorised practice of acquisition. In this sense, in the same way that the technology focus group participants were argued to crave 'connection capital', these

young women sought what might be called 'collection capital' – i.e. a desire to demonstrate that a sufficient number, or a sufficiently wide range of garments could be purchased.

The male students – perhaps less susceptible to cultural norms around bodily presentation which generally beset women more than men – were more pragmatic in their reconciliation of 'enough' clothing with notions of quality and their disposable income. Whilst they agreed the relative satisfaction of, for example, one shirt from Abercrombie equated to ten from Primark, and that, in the words of one male participant, "… if you have the money you're going to get the better stuff", they also felt strongly that buying high quality garments, including those produced to ethical and sustainability principles, was aspirational but not feasible on student budgets. In short, male students seemed less driven by quantity of new acquisitions in order to achieve a sense of consuming 'enough', but, as for their female peers, their consumption was shaped by a sense of what it was reasonable – even culturally appropriate – to spend.

In sum, these three groups made clear the extent to which social media has amplified the usual social pressures associated with the performance of novelty within youth culture. With the (smartphone) camera lens constantly documenting their sartorial choices, even in the most mundane settings, it seems there is increasing pressure to possess enough garments to provide the variety demanded by the public documentation of adolescent social life. Discussion amongst the students highlighted some nuanced perspectives between the two genders, particularly regarding the spaces and scales at which each seeks enough 'choice', and in the context of reconciling disposable income with cultural expectations to perform a specific 'competent consumer' identity. In the section that follows I draw out some of the key findings from these empirical discussions, summarising the tensions that characterise young people's experiences of 'enough' garments and gadgets, and offering brief comment on what this means for the notion of the environmentally sustainable 'Trojan teen'.

Positive Dissent and Punk Precedent: Is there hope for the 'Trojan Teen'?

As the preceding discussion has highlighted, what constitutes 'enough' garments or gadgets for the young people in these focus groups is fundamentally influenced by the demands of the socio-cultural context in which they operate. This context is characterised most conspicuously by expectations around constant connectivity and the ability to 'do' novelty on an almost daily basis. Although very loose forms of consensus were reached about what constituted 'enough' garments or gadgets in some of the focus groups, these views were far from neatly quantifiable. Indeed, attempts to quantify 'enough', whether in terms of garments or gadgets, appear somewhat pointless when situated within the shifting sands that constitute the nexus of consumer culture and youth culture. Rather, a more prescient focus is that nexus itself – the social, economic and cultural forces which profoundly *shape* young people's understandings and experiences of 'enough', as well as how young people might mobilise their agency in order to challenge them.

What was clear across the groups was the importance of acquiring and expressing competencies within which material objects played a fundamental part – the smartphone as the conduit to instant messaging, for instance, or ten t-shirts as a demonstration of the ability to 'do' variety. As suggested in the course of earlier discussion, this hints at the existence of distinct forms of sub-cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986), if not unique to youth culture then certainly vividly characteristic of it. The evidence presented here suggests in particular a craving amongst the participants for what I have termed 'connection capital' and 'collection capital' – knowledge and competence associated with communication and acquisition practices, respectively. These young people sought to make use of

the limited economic capital they possess as students in order to maximise their social capital (i.e. their capacity to influence peers, forge social connections and attract esteem), via the sub-cultural capitals constituted by their participation in practices of technology and clothing consumption. In unpicking this equation, it becomes clear that the driver of profusion in young people's consumption is the specific form (sub)cultural capital(s) take(s), how it/they are achieved, and the nature of the material presence within it/them. How, then, might other forms of cultural capital – conducive to fulfilment on tight budgets yet still effective producers of social connection and esteem – be engendered?

For young people, changing their relationship with material things such that 'enough' is set at an environmentally sustainable level requires thinking about the youth cultural practices in which they and their material things are bound up. Certainly it is neither reasonable nor possible to expect young people – or any group in society, for that matter – to forego the use of material things in cultural practices and identity expression. Doing so is tantamount to asking them to relinquish their sense of self and the social cohesion that binds them as a community (Douglas and Isherwood 1979). Since the desire for material things is built into the human psyche (Belk et al. 2003) – and, as argued above, central to the cultural capital that constitutes young people's social worlds – meeting the sustainability challenge requires the evolution of new relationships between (young) people and things (Gill and Lopes 2011). Acknowledging that many of the most important youth cultural practices involve the communication of affiliation and esteem, it becomes pertinent to ask how these psycho-social needs could be fulfilled in other ways, moving away from the pseudo-satisfiers capable only of generating a false or hollow sense of short-term need-satisfaction (Jackson et al. n.d.). How would fulfilling those needs differently be viewed by others operating within the same socio-cultural space? The latter question is particularly important. As interest in social practices has developed over the last decade (Shove et al. 2012), it has increasingly been recognised that attempting to change behaviours at the level of individuals is, at best, slow and at worst, futile. Instead, focusing on the systems (practices and contexts) within which individuals are obliged to operate tackles the problematic social norms and conventions that inhibit change at an individual level.

At present, and as demonstrated here by the notion of 'collection capital', for many young people their methods of creating peer affiliations and showing esteem rely on the performance of a consumer identity; a role in which they are increasingly frequently cast, even in the context of their university studies. This consumer role is perhaps the most important within their wider portfolio of identities because it is a fundamental enabler of other important adolescent roles within contemporary youth culture. Whilst some, including the students featured here, might be discomforted by the consumer system within which youth culture largely obliges them to operate, when 'everyone else' appears to be getting on with it being the sole individual willing to step outside the dominant social practice and attempt to forge equally meaningful peer relationships but through non-normative practices is a big ask. Most of us need only look back to our own adolescence to remember how difficult it can be to be the one who dares to be different (whether or not that person was us).

In short, for environmentally sustainable notions of 'enough' to characterise contemporary youth culture, a shift in normative social practices must occur whereby processes of affiliation and esteem are produced in less materially-intensive ways. The forms of cultural capital specific to youth need not wholly dematerialise, but there is considerable scope to reconsider the nature, use and form of their material components. This shift would return young people's agency such that their use of material 'tools' can be dictated by them, rather than the producers purveying them – in essence, a decoupling of youth culture from consumer culture. Reclaiming power from the market in this way

is prefigured in the notion of 'positive dissent' (McGrail 2011), a growing trend within the environmental community. With its undertones of rebellion, albeit with a positive focus, this might speak particularly effectively to youth. The growth of services seeking to empower consumers in taking fuller ownership of their possessions through processes of maintenance, repair and repurposing potentially may offer a useful starting point.[2] Such a significant youth cultural shift may be hard to imagine in the contemporary context but there is clear historical precedent, most visibly in the punk era of the 1970s-1980s, where the DIY 'zine'[3] movement emerged to give space to young people's (often anti-corporate) political and cultural ideas (Spencer 2005).

In the punk era, a preference for 'low tech' objects and practices was appealing precisely because it conspicuously countered the mainstream and sought to directly contest capitalism and its associated politics. This is not to say that any shift in youth cultural norms in the twenty-first century demands a low tech approach. On the contrary, the information and ideas needed to create a significant groundswell of change will inevitably be found – and shared – online. In the same way that any 'replacement' culture or practice must offer the same rewards as that being replaced in order to succeed, the new actions promoted must be easily realisable and willingly taken up in everyday contexts in order to stand a chance of becoming normalised (Fröhlich et al. 2013). For contemporary youth who live much of their everyday social life in virtual space, the digital world will be key to scaling up and normalising new, less-materially intensive cultural practices. Laptops, smartphones and tablets will inevitably play their part in this process – but the role they play might be more focused on repairing or 'hacking' those very gadgets, rather than browsing for their replacement.

On the basis of the empirical work presented here, hopes that battalions of environmentally sustainable 'Trojan teens' are ready to drive new modes of consumption seem misplaced. These students – though sometimes frustrated, sometimes anxious about the obligations they feel placed under by the consumerist nature of contemporary youth culture – remain willing participants, disinclined to make any grand statements about the unsustainability of the status quo on their own. As a result, they do not 'own' youth culture; the producers of youth cultural material 'tools' do. This power imbalance requires attention if the potential of the 'Trojan teen' is to be realised. Cynics might question whether an apparently largely politically disengaged youth have the impetus to challenge consumer culture in this way, when much of what it offers is easy, convenient and, superficially at least, appealing. The answer to this lies with young people themselves, and whether they are willing and able to initiate an act of collectivity in form, nature and scale far removed from the small-scale, comfortable sociality familiar to most contemporary youth. Certainly the 'connection capital' and 'collection capital' identified here, whilst demonstrably culturally important for youth, need not persist in their present material-technological form. The densely (virtually) networked nature of contemporary youth culture means that once a sufficiently compelling trigger for change is identified, the cascade from innovative new trend through to widespread everyday practice is likely to be rapid. Who can say what the trigger might be and when it might be pressed, but if 'Trojan teens' can be the transformational catalyst they have been framed as, they may yet be the ones leading the battle cry of 'enough'.

---

[2] Popular examples include volunteer-led repair workshops facilitated by organisations such as Restart and the Repair Café network, as well as websites such as iFixit.com.

[3] An abbreviation of 'magazine'.

Works Cited

Abrams, M. (1959) *The Teenage Consumer*, London: London Press Exchange.

Autio, M. and V. Heinonen (2004) 'To consume or not to consume? Young people's environmentalism in the affluent Finnish society', *Young*, 12 (2), 137-153.

Ballantyne, R., S. Connell, J. Fien (2006) 'Students as catalysts of environmental change: a framework for researching intergenerational influence through environmental education', *Environmental Education Research*, 12 (3), 413-427.

Belk, R., G. Ger, S. Askegaard (2003) 'The Fire of Desire: a multi-sited inquiry into consumer passion', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30 (3), 326-351.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) 'The Forms of Capital', in J. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, New York, USA: Greenwood, pp241-258.

Cleland Woods, H. and H. Scott (2015) '#sleepyteens - Is social media use related to sleep quality, self-esteem, anxiety and depression in adolescence?', paper presented at the British Psychological Society Development Section and Social Section Annual Conference, Manchester, UK, 9-11 September.

Collins, R. and R. Hitchings (2012) 'A tale of two teens: disciplinary boundaries and geographical opportunities in youth consumption and sustainability research', *Area*, 44 (2), 193-199.

Croghan, R., C. Griffin, J. Hunter and A. Phoenix (2006) 'Style Failure: Consumption, identity and social exclusion', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 9 (4), 463-478.

Douglas, M. and B. Isherwood (1979) *The World of Goods: Towards an anthropology of consumption*, Oxford: Routledge.

Fröhlich, G., D. Sellman, F.X. Bogner (2013) 'The influence of situational emotions on the intention for sustainable consumer behaviour in a student-centred intervention', *Environmental Education Research*, 19 (6), 747-764.

Gill, A. and A.M. Lopes (2011) 'On Wearing: A Critical Framework for Valuing Design's Already Made', *Design and Culture*, 3 (3), 307-327.

Isaksen, K.J. and S. Roper (2012) 'The commodification of self-esteem: Branding and British teenagers', Psychology and Marketing, 29 (3), 117-135.

Jackson, T., W. Jager and S. Stagl (n.d.) 'Beyond Insatiability: Needs Theory, Consumption and Sustainability', Working paper series no. 2004/2, Centre for Environmental Strategy, University of Surrey.

Jeffries, L. (2011) 'The Revolution Will Be Soooo Cute: YouTube "Hauls" and the Voice of Young Female Consumers', *Studies in Popular Culture*, 33 (2), 59-75.

Larsson, B., M. Andersson, C. Osbeck (2010) 'Bringing environmentalism home: Children's influence on family consumption in the Nordic countries and beyond', *Childhood*, 17 (1), 129-147.

Livingstone, S. (2002) *Young People and New Media: Childhood and the Changing Media Environment*, London: Sage.

Livingstone, S. (2011) 'Internet, children and youth', in M. Consalvo and C. Ess (Eds.), *The Handbook of Internet Studies*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp.348-368.

Marion, G. and A. Nairn (2011) '"We make the shoes, you make the story" Teenage girls' experiences of fashion: Bricolage, tactics and narrative identity', *Consumption, Markets and Culture*, 14 (1), 29-56.

McAfee, A., V. Dessain, A. Sjoeman (2004) *Zara: IT for Fast Fashion*, Boston MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

McGrail, S. (2011) 'Environmentalism in Transition? Emerging Perspectives, Issues and Futures Practices in Contemporary Environmentalism', *Journal of Futures Studies*, 15 (3), 117-144.

Miles, S. (2000) *Youth Lifestyles in a Changing World*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Phoenix, A. (2005) 'Chapter 4: Young people and consumption: Commonalities and differences in the construction of identities', in Tufte, B., J. Rasmussen and L.B. Christensen (eds.) *Frontrunners or Copycats?* Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press, pp.78-97.

Shove, E., M. Pantzar, M. Watson (2012) *The dynamics of social practice: everyday life and how it changes*, London: Sage.

Spencer, A. (2005) *DIY: The rise of lo-fi culture*, London: Marion Boyars Publishers.

Sweeting, H., K. Hunt and A. Bhaskar (2012) 'Consumerism and well-being in early adolescence', Journal of Youth Studies, 15 (6), 802-820.

Veblen, T. (1915 [1899]) *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, London and New York: Macmillan.